

V. cornea (Pfr.). Natal.

V. pellicula (Fér.). Cape District.

V. Huttoniæ (Bens.) [*Helix Huttoniæ*]. Port Elizabeth.

a. rufofilosa. Port Elizabeth.

β. meridionalis. Port Elizabeth.

γ. aloicola. Port Elizabeth.

V. Planti (Pfr.). Natal.

Helix (Pella) Crawfordi, sp. nov.

H. testa anguste umbilicata, globoso-depressa, hyalina, supra nitente, subtus olivaceo-sericea, utrinque omnino lævi; spira vix elata, apice obtuso; anfractibus quinque, convexiusculis; apertura lunari, labro simplici, acuto, margine columellari suberecto, supra late reflexo, laminam triangularem (sicut in *H. bisculpta*) formante.

Long. 11, lat. 16 mill.

Hab. Port Elizabeth.

A very distinct large smooth-whorled snail, not easily to be compared with any other Cape species. We have great pleasure in uniting with this the name of its discoverer, J. Crawford, Esq., to whose indefatigable researches we are indebted for the whole of the material in this paper.

Helix (Trochonanina) pretoriensis, sp. nov.

H. testa imperforata, conico-trochiformi, olivaceo-fusca; spira elevata, conica, obtusa; anfractibus sex, transversim tenuiliratis, convexiusculis, ultimo carinato: apertura quadrangulari, labro simplici, margine columellari subreflexo.

Long. 3, lat. 2.75 mill.

Hab. Pretoria, Transvaal.

Entirely unlike any South-African species with which we are acquainted. A very interesting though minute trochiform species.

LVI.—*On Ebalia nux, Milne-Edwards: a Reply to the Rev. Canon Norman.* By R. I. POCOCK.

IN the reply with which Canon Norman has favoured me in the October number of this Magazine sundry charges are brought forward of a nature more or less detrimental to my character, and consequently demanding a rejoinder on my part.

In the first place Canon Norman denies that his words of approbation for the manner in which his MS. name was treated by Messrs. Marion and Milne-Edwards can be taken as reflecting discredit upon me—thereby laying me open to the charge of entering upon a controversy without provocation, and of taking offence where none was intended.

In reply to this I may say that if I was alone in my opinion as to this allegation of discourtesy I should be compelled, in the face of Canon Norman's denial, to suspend judgment on the point. But since precisely the same interpretation was independently put upon the sentence referred to by my friend who first drew my attention to the publication of Mr. Bourne's paper, I cannot do otherwise than retain the opinion that I first formed. This fact, moreover—namely the circumstance that exactly the same significance was independently attached to Canon Norman's words by an individual absolutely unconcerned in the matter—goes far to destroy any semblance of truth there might be in the suggestion that the idea of an accusation of discourtesy is merely a product of my guilty conscience, a suggestion which would perhaps have seemed plausible enough if the notion had emanated solely from myself. But if further refutation of this were needed, I might add that I am quite unable to see how my conscience can have influenced me in the matter, for, as I carefully pointed out in my last letter, my mode of employing the *nomen nudum*—*Ebalia nux*—was strictly in accordance with my notions of the dictates of courtesy and common sense; and consequently I had no idea that Canon Norman could possibly find grounds on that score for complaining of ill-treatment at my hands. In short, I do not see how I can have no idea of a thing and yet be conscience-stricken with regard to it.

With regard to Canon Norman's assertion that he took particular pains that his words should *not* bear the construction that was to my knowledge independently put upon them on two occasions, I think the less said the better. I merely refer to the circumstance now with the object of bringing it before the notice of those who are interested in collecting cases of the inadequacy of language to express thought.

In the second place, in connexion with the letter that I wrote to him, I can assure Canon Norman that I never received an answer to it. The postcard that he recollects sending to me I too remember well; but it related to a species of *Mysis* from the Firth of Clyde, and not to *Ebalia nux*.

In the third place, Canon Norman wishes to know which specimens of *Ebalia nux* I chose for description. I am sorry

for having left this matter in doubt; but when I said that two specimens had been "selected as types" I thought I was employing phraseology perfectly intelligible to every systematic zoologist. Since, however, I clearly fell into error by taking this for granted in Canon Norman's case, I am glad that he has shown me the necessity for explaining that the expression was tantamount to saying that the description had been drawn up from these specimens. I imagine, however, perhaps wrongly, that Canon Norman does not altogether approve of my conduct in describing specimens that he had sent to Mr. Miers at the Natural History Museum; for he appeals to the judgment of others to decide as to the courtesy of this act. Now I cannot help thinking that if Canon Norman had stayed for a moment to ask himself what could be my reasons for thus describing these specimens, he would have done me the justice to see that I was acting altogether for the best. But to state at length all the considerations which influenced me in the matter would involve a long explanation of my personal opinions as to the value and significance of *types* of species—an explanation which would be wholly out of place on an occasion like the present. Consequently I shall content myself with saying briefly that my reasons for not describing the 'Flying Fox' specimen were in the main three in number:—(1) There was but one specimen, and that a damaged one; (2) this specimen, as I pointed out, differs slightly, but certainly, in sculpturing, from the Mediterranean specimens that I had seen; and (3) I consequently thought it both expedient and just, when adopting the name Canon Norman had proposed, to affix it definitely to specimens to which he had himself applied it.

And, lastly, Canon Norman accuses me of carelessness for not consulting the work in which Prof. A. Milne-Edwards has admirably figured *Ebalia nux*—a work which should certainly not have been neglected by a man writing on Atlantic Crustaceans with a "magnificent library at his elbow." In reply to this I cannot do better than quote *verbatim* an extract from a letter which I received some three or four weeks ago from Prof. A. Milne-Edwards. Being unable to find the figure of *Ebalia nux* from the reference that Canon Norman gives, I wrote to Prof. Milne-Edwards on the point, and he courteously and promptly replied as follows:—" . . . J'ai effectivement figuré l'*Ebalia nux* dans un ouvrage intitulé *Recueil de figures de Crustacés nouveaux ou peu connus*, in 4°, 44 Planches, Avril, 1883. Cet ouvrage n'a été tiré qu'à 50 exemplaires que j'ai de suite envoyé aux naturalistes qui, à cette époque, s'occupaient de carcinologie.

Quelques exemplaires seulement ont été mis en vente, aussi l'ouvrage est il devenu rare et presque introuvable. Je n'en ai qu'un seul exemplaire ce qui m'empêche de vous l'envoyer, mais je vous adresse la planche relative à l'*Ebalia nux* qui pourra vous être utile. . . ."

This sufficiently accounts for the fact that there is no copy of this work in the library of the Natural History Museum nor yet in the library either of the Royal, or Linnean, or Zoological Society. So that, under the circumstances, I think I can hardly be blamed for not having seen it.

LVII.—*On the Generic Name of Asterias sanguinolenta*,
O. F. Müller. By F. JEFFREY BELL.

FOR more than thirty years the common blood-red starfish of the North-European seas has, by general consent, been called *Cribrella sanguinolenta* (or *C. oculata* by some who ought to know better). Internal evidence too often shows that "synonymy" is synonymous with "copying;" so perhaps this general consent only means that one of those who have written on the subject during the last thirty years has had the opportunity of consulting Dr. Lütken's valuable works. Mr. Sladen, who may be complimented on the meaning he is able to put into a couple of brackets, seems to have had some original doubts, for he writes in his massive 'Challenger' Report (p. 540)

"Genus *Cribrella* (Agassiz), Forbes,"

which, being "writ large," means, I presume, this generic name was invented by Agassiz and appropriated by Forbes; and if it does mean that, it expresses, in a very succinct manner, a perfectly correct statement.

When, however, one finds a man with what look like stolen goods one is apt to make a searching inquiry into his title. Do this in the present case and you get a disastrous result!

Agassiz wrote (Mém. Soc. Neuchatel, i. (1835), p. 191):—

"5. LINKIA, Nardo.—*Cribrella*, Ag. Msc."

This clearly means, "what Nardo in 1834 called *Linkia* I (Agassiz) have, in MSS., called *Cribrella*;" and the two terms were in Agassiz's estimation equivalent.

How are cases of this kind to be dealt with? The rules of the British Association declare that "a later name of the